DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 263 24, UD 010 355

AUTHOR Teahan, John E.
TITLE Some Effects of Audio-Visual Techniques on Racial Self-Concept. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-E-040
PUB DATE Nov 69
GRANT OEG-0-8-080040-3712(010)
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Aspiration, Attitude Tests, Black Community, *Changing Attitudes, Control Groups, Economically Disadvantaged, Experimental Groups, Hypothesis Testing, *Instructional Films, Negative Attitudes, *Negro Students, Predictive Ability (Testing), Professional Personnel, Questionnaires, *Racial Attitudes, *Self Concept, Test Results

ABSTRACT

This investigation was an attempt to follow up previous research dealing with the impact of films of successful Negro professionals, who had come from impoverished beginnings, on the self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth. Students from three schools saw 12 films of six black professionals and six white professionals on a once-a-week basis. Controls who saw no films were drawn from each school. Another school saw only six black films on a weekly basis, while its control was a school from a similar nieghborhood which saw no films. Students who saw films changed significantly following the films in terms of their evaluation of white photographs, with lower socioeconomic males becoming more negative toward white faces following the films. Experimentals also changed significantly in their rejection of attitudes of white superiority, while controls moved in the opposite direction, showing less racial pride over time. No differences between experimentals and controls appeared in terms of desired goals or predicted success. The results are held to support the hypothesis that the first change in terms of a more positive self-concept among Negroes may be a more negative attitude toward whites as they attempt to explode the myth of white superiority for themselves and redirect hostility previously turned inward toward self. For related earlier report, see ED 013 862. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of the original document.] (RJ)

BR 8-E-040
PA-24
UD

ED040263

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 8-E-040

Grant No. OEG-0-8-080040-3712(010)

SOME EFFECTS OF AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNIQUES ON RACIAL SELF-CONCEPT

November 1969

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 010355

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Final Report

Project No. 8-E-040

Grant No. OEG-0-8-080040-3712(010)

Some Effects of Audio-Visual Techniques on Racial Self-Concept

John E. Teahan
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

November 1969

UD010355

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Table of Contents

Summary..... 1

Introduction..... 2

The Problem..... 3

Procedure..... 5
- Film Description..... 5
- Subjects..... 7
- Pre- and Post-Testing and Film Introduction... 8
- Film Presentation..... 8
- Instruments..... 10
- Analysis of Data..... 11

Results..... 12
- Pre-test Differences for Black and White Photographs..... 23
- Social Survey Questions..... 29
- "Wished For" and Predicted Goals..... 35
- Pre-test Differences on "Wished For" and Predicted Goals..... 44

Discussion of Results..... 51

Summary and Conclusions..... 56

Bibliography..... 57

Appendix..... 59

- Pre-test Instructions
- Post-test Instructions
- Film Instructions
  - Face Sheet for Test Booklet
  - Photograph Scales for Elementary Students
  - Photograph Scales for High School Students
- "Wished For" and Predicted Goals
- Social Survey Questions
- Tables 31, 32, and 33

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs at Elementary Schools A and B	14
Table 2	Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs at Elementary School C	15
Table 3	Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs at Elementary School D for Grades VI and VIII	16
Table 4	Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs at High School E	17
Table 5	Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Level and by Grade Level at Schools A-B	18
Table 6	Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Level at School C	19
Table 7	Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Levels at School D for Grades VI and VIII	20
Table 8	Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Socio-Economic Level at All-Male School E	21
Table 9	Means for Black and White Photographs by Grade Level at Schools C and E	22
Table 10	Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at Schools A and B	25
Table 11	Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School C	26
Table 12	Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School D for Grades VI and VIII	27
Table 13	Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School E	28
Table 14	Analysis of Variance of White Superiority and Foreigner Items from the Social Survey Questions for Grade VIII Students at School D	30
Table 15	Analysis of Variance of White Superiority and Foreigner Items from the Social Survey Questions for Students at School E	31
Table 16	Means for White Superiority and Foreigner Items for Experimental and Control Grade VIII Students by Sex and Socio-Economic Levels at School D	32

LIST OF TABLES

Table 17 Means for White Superiority and Foreigner Items for Experimentals and Controls by Socio-Economic Level at School E ... 33

Table 18 Means for White Superiority Items for Experimentals and Controls with Grade and Socio-Economic Level at School E 34

Table 19 Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions for Students at Schools A (Experimental) and B (Control) 37

Table 20 Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions for Students at School C 38

Table 21 Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions at School D ... 39

Table 22 Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions at School E ... 40

Table 23 Means for High and Low Socio-Economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on "Wished For" Goals at Schools A-B ... 41

Table 24 Means for High and Low Socio-Economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on "Wished For" Goals at School C 42

Table 25 Means for High and Low Socio-Economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on Predicted Goals at School D 43

Table 26 Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at Schools A and B 46

Table 27 Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School C 47

Table 28 Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School D 48

Table 29 Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School E 49

Table 30 Means of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions of High and Low Socio-Economic Males and Females at All Schools 50

Summary

This investigation was an attempt to follow up previous research dealing with the impact of films of successful Negro professionals, who had come from impoverished beginnings, on the self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth who might receive some inspiration from these success stories. Particular interest was focused on a hypothesis emerging from the previous study, namely, that an improvement in the self0concept or in the racial pride of Negro youth will result, at least initially, in greater hostility toward whites.

Elementary students from four schools in a large midwestern city and boys from one high school served as the subjects of the investigation. Students from three schools saw twelve films of six black professionals and six white professionals on a once-a-week basis; and controls, who saw no films, were drawn from each school. Another school saw only six black films on a weekly basis, while its control was a school from a similar neighborhood which saw no films. Pre- and post-testing was done one month prior to the first film and one month following the last film. Tests used included the differential reaction of students to anonymous black and white faces, which were rated on various personality traits; a level of aspiration method, which attempted to gauge desired future goals, as well as predictions of success; and at the high school level, a questionnaire which dealt with attitudes of racial superiority and inferiority.

Similar to previous findings, students who saw films changed significantly following the films in terms of their evaluation of white photographs, with lower socio-economic males becoming more negative toward white faces following the films. Experimentals also changed significantly in their rejection of attitudes of white superiority, while controls moved in the opposite direction, showing less racial pride over time. Unlike previous findings, no differences between experimentals and controls appeared in terms of desired goals or predicted success. However, women had lower goal orientations than males and lower socio-economic status seemed to significantly depress the predicted success of males more than females. Lower socio-economic status seemed particularly harmful if these males were in predominantly lower class schools, while it seemed less harmful if most peers were middle class. It was felt that the results supported the hypothesis that the first change in terms of a more positive self-concept among Negroes may be a more negative attitude toward whites as they attempt to explode the myth of white superiority for themselves and redirect hostility previously turned inward toward the self.

Introduction

This research was an attempt to follow up and enlarge upon some of the hypotheses emerging from Office of Education Grant No. OE-7-59-0502-281, entitled "Some effects of audio-visual techniques on level of aspiration and ethnocentric shift." Its purpose was, essentially, to study the impact of films of successful Negro professionals, who had come from impoverished beginnings, on the self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth who might receive some inspiration from these "success stories."

In addition, the investigator was particularly interested in one finding which seemed to emerge from the previous study, namely, that an improvement in the self-concept of a Negro youth will result, at least initially, in greater hostility toward whites. This would originate in rage, which had formerly been turned toward the self in the form of self-hate and low self-esteem, as a result of identification with the aggressor and which was then externalized, or turned outward, against the perceived aggressor.

The investigator is extremely grateful to the Chicago Catholic Board of Education for allowing this study to take place, and to all of the school officials who were so giving in terms of cooperation and aid at each step of the project. The coordinator of research, Miss Julia Bell, was a key person in smoothing the way and it is especially to her that the investigator feels a deep sense of gratitude.

The Problem

This work stemmed from the observation often made that the Negro has remained, too often, an invisible man in our culture, whose presence has been acknowledged only when he threatened our complacency. Numerous research studies by the Clarks (1947, 1950), Landreth and Johnson (1953, Munn (1950, Marks (1943, and others have all shown that not only does the Negro recognize at an early age that his skin differs from whites', but that there is a tendency for almost all children to show preference for white skin. The popularity of hair straighteners and skin bleaches up until recently, when the "black is beautiful movement" gained momentum, attests to the persistence of these attitudes into adulthood. It was further hypothesized that the Negro, because of his lack of history (i.e., lack in terms of absence of black studies) is forced more than other minority groups to look to more contemporary models in order to enhance self-esteem and find a sense of value and worth.

The absence of good models within the Negro's immediate environment, particularly in the lower socio-economic and culturally-deprived areas, influences his whole range of values, particularly those dealing with level of aspiration and motivation to achieve. This is, of course, especially true in the more rural areas of the South where a chronic condition of cultural deprivation may even result in impaired intellectual capacity (Young and Bright, 1954), (Teahan and Drews, 1962). Although there have been attempts on the part of Negro publications to point out that the Negro is making contributions to society in more than just the entertainment and sports worlds, there has been little real acknowledgement of this from the white community whose opinion is still, albeit ambivalently, given great weight. Successful Negroes, whether they are scholars and scientists, business executives, or skilled craftsmen and technicians, have remained shadowy figures and invisible men who have failed to have much impact on the Negro youth who needs them most. Thus, in the present study, an attempt was made to bring successful Negroes out of the shadows and allow young Negroes an opportunity to meet and to know them--to enter their lives, at least momentarily, through the medium of motion pictures, and, hopefully, to come away with something of value which may even alter the course of their lives.

A previous study (Teahan and Hug, 1969) had already offered that films of this nature could be instrumental in creating chang self-concept and level of aspiration of Negro youth. Experimenta (who saw films) at both the elementary and junior high school lev significantly more optimistic than controls about their chances f success. In addition, they also became more realistic about "wis goals, while their controls became more unrealistic about desired goals and more pessimistic about their ultimate chances for succe results were felt to reflect a change in the self-concept of expe who were showing less disparity between "idealized" and "expected" achievement. This result was also felt to parallel pre- and post studies (Rogers and Dymond, 1954) in which successful therapy cas strated less disparity between ideal and real self following trea

These same Negro students also changed significantly in thei ential responses to white and Negro photographs which they rated number of different personality traits. However, contrary to exp significant changes following the film experience took place on w rather than black photographs for both elementary and junior high Experimentals seemed to become significantly more negative in the tion of white photographs, while controls tended to drift in the direction over a similar period of time. This was felt to reflec exploding of the myth of white superiority as the Negro gained in esteem, almost as if he were saying to himself, "I am better than viously thought and you (whites) are much worse." There was felt some support for this interpretation in the current trends toward power" and in the black Muslim movement where the attempt is firs to focus the attention of members on the premise that the white m corrupt and evil devil in order to begin their program of instill greater sense of racial pride among their members.

Thus, the present study represents an attempt to follow up a in some ways the results found in the previous investigation. Th was conducted with a larger sample of subjects in a more metropol An attempt was also made with older subjects to measure racial at regarding white superiority more directly in order to clarify the tation previously made garding the changed reaction to white photo This study was also done with the understanding that the Negro has less of an "invisible man" than he was four years ago when the pr study was conducted. Black faces have become more familiar in TV films, and racial barriers in industry, business and education are to crumble. However, in spite of advances, the need for good mode sists and the impact of the films should still be important.

Procedure

Film Description

Twelve men (6 Negro and 6 white males) are the subjects of twelve films, which range in length from 15-25 minutes. Negroes were chosen from those occupational areas where they had either been excluded previously because of prejudice, or where they had been active but unpublicized.

The following men are used as the subjects of films.

Negroes

Richard Hunt	Sculptor
Theodore Sherred, M.D., Ph.D.	Physician-Pharmacologist, Univ. Ill. Med. School
Twylie Barker, Ph.D.	Political Scientist, Univ. Ill.
Donald Richards	Systems Engineer, IBM
John Moutousamy, B.S., Arch.	Architect
Louis Langston	Carson, Pirie & Scott

Whites

Vin Rosenthal, Ph.D.	Clinical Psychologist, N'western Med. School
George L. Weisbard, LLB, C.P.A.	Accountant (CPA)
Abraham Marovitz, LLB	Federal Judge, Dist. Ct.
Edward Rooney	Reporter, Chicago Daily News
Sterling Quinlan	V-P, Field Enterprises Gen. Mgr., Radio & TV
Steven Sichak, M.S.	Sr. Research Chemist, Toni Co.

Almost all film subjects (black and white) had overcome religious, economic or personal obstacles in their past, and all are men who might serve as some inspiration for youth. Thus, two of the subjects chosen, George Weisbard, accountant, and Abraham Marovitz, judge, were both born in poverty and had to overcome severe economic problems to reach success. In addition, both Weisbard and Vin Rosenthal (clinical psychologist) suffered from religious prejudice and Rosenthal had a severely disturbed childhood and adolescence which was overcome only through professional help. Steven Sichak (chemist) worked in the steel mills to put himself through school, and Sterling Quinlan (TV and communications) was a high school dropout who became a hobo during the 1930's, but who later returned to school and worked his way in the field of radio to the Vice-Presidency of American Broadcasting Corporation, and, finally, to the Vice-Presidency of Field Enterprises and General Manager of WFLD-TV, Chicago. Edward Rooney (reporter) was chosen because he covered the Selma march and is active fighting block-busting on the part of real estate companies in his neighborhood, which is now becoming integrated.

Possibly only two of the Negroes in the films had what could be called "middle-class" backgrounds, and all were born in ghettoes or equally undesirable settings. Richard Hunt, sculptor, now has an international reputation in his media and still lives in what can only be described as a very poor neighborhood. Theodore Sherrod, who has both an M.D. and a Ph.D. in Pharmacology, was the son of a sharecropper who did not even begin to attend school until the age of nine. Twylie Barker, political scientist, was also born and raised in a small town in the South and has recently published a book dealing with the most significant legislation of the Supreme Court in the past ten years and its repercussions. Lewis Langston, executive-in-training with Carson, Pirie & Scott, started in the stockroom and is now a buyer. Don Richards, system engineer for IBM, was the son of a postal employee and probably has the most middle-class background of all Negro subjects, but was chosen because of his personable manner and intensely interesting work. John Moutousamy, architect, had,, at the time of filming, just received approval of his housing project for middle-income people by the city of Chicago. This was to be the first integrated housing project financed entirely by Negro capital in the city of Chicago.

The general format used in each film was to have the first half deal with the occupation of the person involved. Thus, the interview with the film subject was done at his place of business and focused on the nature of his work, the educational requirements, the satisfactions he found in it, the potentials this field offered to new persons entering it, etc. The second half of the movie was filmed in the subject's home and here members of the family were introduced. In this section, the interviewer attempted to uncover more personal information about the man himself, his early childhood, events and persons which he felt shaped his life, his goals for himself and his children, etc. It was actually this part of the film

that the investigator wished to stress most because of his interest in having the viewer come away from a movie with the feeling that he had just met someone new whom he understood, at least to some degree, and whom he, hopefully, liked as a person.

Subjects[1]

Five different schools in the Catholic school system of a large industrial city were involved in the study. Since each differed in terms of either experimental conditions, predominate socio-economic level, or age and sex dimensions, they will be discussed separately.

Schools A and B were primarily lower socio-economic elementary schools and all students in grades 5 through 8 participated. School A (224 subjects with 100 males and 124 females) was designated as the experimental school and all students at these grade levels were shown six black films on a once-a-week basis over a six-week period. School B (127 subjects with 59 males and 68 females) was designated as the control school for School A and students here received no film experience.

School C was a primarily middle-class elementary school and all students in grades 6 through 8 participated. Since there were two classes at each grade level, one was designated as the experimental class and one as the control class for each of the three grades. This resulted in 99 experimental subjects (45 males and 55 females) and 94 controls (45 males and 49 females). Experimentals at School C differed from School A, however, in that all twelve films (six black and six white) were shown on a once-a-week basis over a twelve-week period.

School D was similar to school C in its socio-economic composition. Unfortunately, due to an error by assistants who administered the pre-tests, although grades 6 were correctly given those tests administered to other elementary grades, grade 8 classes were given those tests which had been designed for the high school subjects. In addition, grade 7 had to be discarded because the control and experimental classes were given different test booklets, so that comparison was impossible. Thus, the final usable sample for analysis was 32 experimentals at 6th grade with 14 males and 18 females, and 38 controls with 17 males and 21 females. For grade 8, there were 34 experimentals with 19 males and 15 females and 36 controls with 20 males and 16 females. As with school C, all experimentals saw the entire twelve films over a twelve-week period.[2]

[1] Since some subjects had incomplete data, this figure might change slightly (i.e., by one or two subjects) from one analysis to the next.

[2] Because all subjects at every grade level received the Wished For and Predicted Goals, the grade 7 classes of 19 experimentals (12 male and 7 female) and 24 controls (12 males and 12 females) are included in this analysis.

School E was an all male senior high school and students from grades 9 through 11 participated in the study. While testing and film viewing at all other schools was done in the classroom, here it was done during study periods with mixed grade levels. Two study periods composed of 56 students was designated as the experimental groups. From two other study groups, 62 controls were also chosen. Again, experimentals were shown all 12 films over a twelve-week period, while controls had no such film experience.

Pre- and Post Testing and Film Introduction

One of the most important features of the experiment which the investigator tried to control was that the students used as experimental subjects did not associate the film experience with pre- or post-testing. This, it is felt, was accomplished by pretesting one month prior to the introduction of the first film showing and post-testing one month following the last film presentation. This meant that in School A, a 14-week interval took place between pre- and post-testing, while in Schools C, D, and E, an interval of 20 weeks intervened. In addition, the films were introduced in the classrooms by their teachers[1] as a new method of imparting vocational information--new because of the fact that the films would not only allow the viewer to learn about the occupation in question, but would also give a glimpse into the person involved in the occupation. Therefore, the films would allow the student to meet the person's family, learn about his hopes, attitudes toward life and the early experiences which might have played some role in his vocational choice.

Pre-testing[1] was done by black students who identified themselves as being involved in research conducted under the auspices of Wayne State University, and they introduced the experiment as one involving the ability to tell about people simply on the basis of how they look. They went into some detail about the hypothesis that some psychologists feel that we may react unconsciously to tiny cues in the faces of people which may give us information about them, even though we may be unaware that we are actually receiving it. Students were also told that other tests would be administered which were felt to measure things related to this ability. All students seemed to accept this explanation regarding the purpose behind testing. Post-testing was explained in terms of the experimenter's desire to determine whether the experience of having once tried to tell about people simply on the basis of how they looked enabled the subject to do better at this task than someone doing it for the first time. This explanation also seemed to be accepted, for at no time did any student hint that he saw some connection between the testing and the film experience.

Film Presentation

Films were shown to experimental students on a weekly basis in their classrooms. Order of presentation was: federal judge, systems entineer, reporter, architect, clinical psychologist, T.V. executive,

[1] Copies of film introduction and pre- and post-testing instructions can be found in the appendix.

sculptor, political scientist, chemist, pharmacologist, accountant and executive trainee. For that school which saw only black films, the order of Negroes was identical to the above, i.e., systems entineer, architect, sculptor, political scientist, pharmacologist and executive trainee.

Instruments

1. Photograph Technique:

As with the previous investigation, the primary instrument used for measuring change, as a result of the film presentation, was the differential reaction to full face photographs of anonymous black and white males. A booklet with five photographs (three white and two black) was presented to the subject and he was asked to evaluate each photograph separately in terms of what kind of personality he felt characterized the pictured person[1]. He was asked to try to avoid thinking about the reasons for his ratings, but instead was urged to try to give his "gut reaction" to each photo as he viewed it. Elementary students (grades five through eight) used a simple four-point scale for each of twelve traits. High school students (grades nine through eleven) rated the photos using a five-point scale[2] on each of sixteen traits. THus, each photograph received a total score ranging from 12-48 for elementary students and from 16-80 for high school students, with the highest score reflecting a more negative attitude toward the pictured person.

2. Social Survey Questions:

This questionnaire was primarily composed of items taken from the Levinson F scale. Buried among these items were statements dealing with attitudes of white superiority or having racial overtones, and items taken from the California E scaling dealing with negative feelings toward foreigners. The items of a racial nature (labeled "white" in the appendix) were worded so as not to be too inflamatory and yet to give some opportunity for black subjects to express their feelings regarding racial inferiority-superiority attitudes among blacks and whites. The foreigner items were scored because of the fact that previous research had seemed to indicate that whites were prone to become more negative toward both Negroes and foreigners if their status strivings were threatened by films of successful blacks. It was anticipated that the schools would b contain some whites whose ethnocentric attitudes could also be studied. However, as was discovered during testing, there were too few whites to analyze properly. In spite of this, the foreigner items were analyzed for black subjects in the event that some displacement of hostility toward whites might occur on the foreigner items.

3. Wished For and Predicted Goals:

This instrument, which was also used in previous research with the films, was an attempt to ascertain the level of aspiration and future occupational goal expectations of the subjects. All students were asked to respond with their first and second choices to two questions[2].

[1] Photographs were presented in a fixed order (1) white, (2) white, (3) Negro, (4) white, (5) Negro. See appendix for exact pretest instructions.

[2] See appendix for exact copies of the tests and scales used.

(a) What would you most like to become in the future? (regardless of your ability or the job opportunities)

(b) What do you think you'll really end up as? (this time try to be realistic about what you'll actually end up doing)

Analysis of Data:

Analysis of photographs was first done treating scores to each photograph as repeated measures. Analysis of total scores for black and white photos separately was then made with between factors including films - no films, sex of student, grade level (in order to control for age) and occupation of father. The latter was designated as either high or low socio-economic level with highs composed of father's occupations with scores from one through five on the Warner, Meeker and Eells Scale. Lower socio-economic students had father's occupational levels of either six or seven, which essentially meant unskilled or minimally skilled laborers. Because of the fact that previous research had shown the most significant changes occurring in the treatment of white photographs, following films, the division of scores into total white and black photographs seemed justified.

Because of an error in test administration, it was necessary to analyze the photograph results at School D separately for Grades VI and VIII. Grade VII had to be discarded because experimentals and controls received different forms. However, the "Wished For and Predicted Goals" were uniform for all grades, and, therefore, an analysis of the entire school could be done for this instrument. Although previous research with these questions (Teahan and Hug, 1969) had revealed that the differential reaction to the questions was crucial (with experimentals dropping on one and rising on another), this was not true for the present data and only the results for separate analysis of each question are contained in this report. Analysis of the difference between difference scores proved fruitless and examination of the means also revealed no trends similar to the previous study.

Results

The analysis of variance for total scores on black and white photographs, analyzed separately, are contained in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 for Schools A-B, C, D, and E respectively. Analyses were done with race of photographs considered separately, because previous research (Teahan and Hug, 1969) showed changes following films took place primarily in the treatment of white photographs by Negro subjects. At that time, it was also discovered that some photographs were treated differently from others following the experimental condition. These photographs were changed in the present study and an analysis was done for each school using individual photograph scores as repeated measures. There was evidence that subjects did treat some photographs differently, but this did not involve the experimental condition. Thus, it will not be dealt with here, but the complete analyses of variance using photograph scores as repeated measures can be found in the appendix.

Tables 2 and 4 show that lower socio-economic experimental male subjects at Schools C and E both changed significantly in their treatment of white photographs following the film experience ($F=6.88$, significant at the .01 level for a film x sex x socio-economic interation at School C; $F=7.10$, significant at the .01 level for a film x socio-economic interaction in the all male School E.) An examination of means in Tables 6 and 8 reveal that these differences were primarily due to lower socio-economic males becoming more negative toward white photographs following the film presentation. All subjects with the exception of the low experimental males at School E also became more positive toward black photographs on retesting, regardless of whether they were experimentals or controls.

The other two schools (viewing Schools A-B as one school, since B served as A's control) also showed some significant changes on white photographs, but these results are not identical to those found at C and E. Since School D was the only other school to have the same experimental condition (i.e., view <u>both</u> black and white films, rather than just black), the apparent incompatibility of its results will be noted first. As may be remembered, an error in administration forced Grades VI and VIII to be analyzed separately, since these grades received different rating scales for photos. These results are presented in Table 3. A film x sex interaction at Grade VI reveals an F ratio of 5.49 for white photos, which is significant at the .05 level. The means in Table 7 reveal that this is the result of experimental males becoming significantly more negative toward white photos following the films, and closer inspection of these means shows that the greatest contribution to this effect did seem to come from lower socio-economic males. Females, on the other hand, especially experimental females, showed a tendency to become slightly more positive toward white photographs following the films.

The results at Grade VIII for School D, however, do not seem similar to either Schools C and E, or to the Grade VI students. Thus, Table 3 reveals the most significant change taking place was in terms of the treatment of black photographs (film effect x sex x socio-economic status, $F=7.23$, significant at the .01 level).Table 7 again reveals that lower

socio-economic experimental males seem to be contributing most to this effect by becoming significantly more positive toward the black photographs following the films. Higher socio-economic females are also contributing to this effect, while high males and low females are not. Most controls, however, have drifted in a more negative direction over time with the exception of high males. However, there were no significant differences in the treatment of white photos at this Grade VIII level, and an examination of the means showed that almost all males, whether experimental or control, tended to become more negative toward white photographs. Females, on the other hand, became slightly more positive. However, this F ratio of 2.89 failed to reach the level required for statistical significance.

It is with Schools A-B that there seems to be the least similarity of results with other schools. One must, however, consider the fact that the experimentals at this school (A) saw only black films and that this may play some role in the differential results. The only significant effect at this school was in terms of film x grade ($F = 2.98$, significant at the .05 level). This was again due to the treatment of white photographs following the films. An examination of the means in Table 5 reveal that experimentals at the higher grade levels became more negative toward white photographs, while controls tended to change in the opposite direction. This kind of trend was not present in any other school.

Although some grade differences seemed to be present at Schools C ($F = 3.51$, significant at the .05 level) and E ($F = 5.55$, significant at the .05 level), it is difficult to understand these changes. An examination of the means in Table 9 reveal that these F ratios were primarily due to differences in one grade level, rather than being due to some consistent trend. Thus, all students (both experimentals and controls) at the Grade VIII level in School C, and at Grade XI in School E, are those students responsible for this significant effect in that they became more positive toward white photos, while students at lower grade levels became more negative. It is not possible to make this comparison at School D, since different tests were used at different grade levels. However, it is interesting to note in Table 5 that a similar trend is present at Schools A-B. This is not statistically significant, however, ($F = 1.68$) and it is reversed by the introduction of the film condition with experimentals at the higher grades becoming more negative.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs

at Elementary Schools A and B

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	79.76	2.86	1.30	.08
B - Sex	1	44.44	1.60	3.68	.21
C - Grade	3	2.65	.09	28.78	1.68
D - Socio-Econ.	1	9.16	.32	3.28	.19
A X B	1	.53	.01	11.05	.64
A X C	3	3.80	.14	50.92	2.98*
A X D	1	53.83	1.93	.26	.02
B X C	3	25.70	.92	1.244	.07
B X D	1	.08	.00	4.76	.28
C X D	3	18.63	.66	1.79	.10
A X B X C	3	48.43	1.74	19.38	1.13
A X B X D	1	3.31	.12	43.40	2.54
A X C X D	3	23.59	.85	5.46	.32
B X C X D	3	10.99	.39	4.03	.23
A X B X C X D	3	34.85	1.25	2.22	.13
S	291	27.85		17.08	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs at Elementary School C

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	3.18	.13	1.01	.08
B - Sex	1	.39	.01	13.42	1.05
C - Grade	2	9.36	.38	44.96	3.51*
D - Socio-Econ.	1	9.74	.40	1.99	.15
A X B	1	25.43	1.04	8.57	.66
A X C	2	20.01	.82	2.19	.17
A X D	1	29.18	1.19	.10	.01
B X C	2	30.79	1.26	2.52	.19
B X D	1	75.41	3.09	36.94	2.88
C X D	2	46.45	1.91	20.85	1.63
A X B X C	2	14.72	.60	8.28	.65
A X B X D	1	1.19	.05	88.06	6.88**
A X C X D	2	16.48	.67	23.27	1.81
B X C X D	2	.17	.00	1.01	.08
A X B X C X D	2	8.42	.34	1.38	.10
S	168	24.34		12.80	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs at Elementary School D for Grades VI and VIII

Grade VI

Source	df	Black Photographs MS	F ratios	White Photogr MS	F rat
A - Film Effect	1	20.80	.92	.37	
B - Sex	1	10.14	.45	1.35	
C - Grade (VI Only)	-	-	-	-	
D - Socio-Econ.	1	8.12	.36	1.16	
A X B	1	5.50	.24	79.29	5
A X D	1	.44	.02	28.06	1
B X D	1	8.94	.40	7.06	
A X B X D	1	.75	.03	3.94	
S	62	22.55		14.44	

Grade VIII

A - Film Effect	1	38.68	.83	2.46	
B - Sex	1	134.95	2.89	115.96	3
C - Grade (VIII Only)	-	-	-	-	
D - Socio-Econ.	1	110.37	2.36	.21	
A X B	1	1.30	.03	25.18	
A X D	1	22.95	.49	14.39	
B X D	1	78.51	1.67	2.22	
A X B X D	1	338.01	7.23**	.29	
S	62	46.76		35.96	

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

Table 4

Analysis of Variance for Black and White Photographs

at High School E

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	11.99	.35	11.29	.64
B - Sex (all male)	-	-	-	-	-
C - Grade	1	42.37	1.24	97.87	5.55*
D - Socio-Econ.	1	52.81	1.54	5.74	.32
A X C	2	11.42	.33	8.09	.45
A X D	1	.00	.00	125.20	7.10**
B X D	2	.77	.02	8.04	.45
A X C X D	2	1.11	.03	36.46	2.07
S	98	34.22		17.64	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 5

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Level and by Grade Level at Schools A-B

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Black Photos	N-32	N-60	N-45	N-72	N-10	N-41	N-17	N-46
Pre-test	26.59	26.04	25.52	25.99	22.81	25.25	23.75	23.88
Post-test	24.67	25.10	25.05	25.88	24.02	24.42	25.23	24.26
White Photos								
Pre-test	27.73	26.99	26.47	26.43	26.89	26.34	25.44	27.15
Post-test	28.58	27.30	26.43	27.23	26.33	27.47	27.06	27.71

	Grade V		Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
Black Photos	Exp. N=46	Con. N=35	Exp. N=55	Con. N=22	Exp. N=66	Con. N=38	Exp. N=52	Con. N=19
Pre-test	25.57	23.62	25.50	23.70	25.79	24.02	27.27	24.34
Post-test	24.13	24.30	24.48	24.28	25.46	24.69	26.64	24.64
White Photos								
Pre-test	25.95	24.72	25.77	26.59	27.73	26.37	28.17	28.14
Post-test	25.87	27.87	26.77	27.17	28.62	25.95	28.26	27.58

Table 6

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Level at School C

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
Black Photos	High N-21	Low N-24	High N-26	Low N-28	High N-30	Low N-15	High N-28	Low N-20
Pre-test	26.20	25.55	26.67	26.43	25.59	25.02	25.46	27.83
Post-test	23.72	24.64	25.82	24.971	24.68	24.42	25.33	24.79
White Photos								
Pre-test	28.23	26.57	28.00	27.40	27.37	27.78	28.19	26.75
Post-test	28.22	27.20	28.38	27.75	28.54	26.76	28.08	29.17

Table 7

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Sex and Socio-Economic Levels at School D for Grades VI and VIII

Grade VI

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
Black Photos	High N-8	Low N-6	High N-12	Low N-6	High N-7	Low N-10	High N-13	Low N-8
Pre-test	23.94	23.50	26.12	26.17	27.07	26.10	23.92	25.69
Post-test	23.38	24.25	26.17	25.75	25.86	26.30	21.85	23.94
White Photos								
Pre-test	26.96	26.55	30.92	29.17	29.43	29.67	27.85	28.17
Post-test	27.79	28.89	29.22	29.06	29.95	28.03	29.28	29.58

Grade VIII

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
Black Photos	High N-11	Low N-8	High N-12	Low N-3	High N-13	Low N-7	High N-8	Low N-8
Pre-test	44.18	39.00	47.92	41.83	44.62	41.79	42.31	43.19
Post-test	42.54	34.31	42.42	47.50	41.42	42.43	44.31	44.12
White Photos								
Pre-test	45.97	49.42	44.00	43.32	49.67	44.14	47.42	49.54
Post-test	46.36	51.50	43.39	43.44	52.10	46.00	45.88	46.88

Table 8

Means for Black and White Photographs for Experimentals and Controls by Socio-Economic Level at All-Male School E

	Experimentals		Controls	
Black Photos	High N-36	Low N-18	High N-33	Low N-23
Pre-test	44.84	43.92	45.73	46.63
Post-test	43.74	44.50	44.03	45.67
White Photos				
Pre-test	48.35	47.54	47.73	49.16
Post-test	48.27	49.04	49.65	48.82

Table 9

Means for Black and White Photographs by Grade Level at Schools C and E

School C

	Grade VI N-62	Grade VII N-56	Grade VIII N-74
Black Photos			
Pre-test	25.78	26.28	26.22
Post-test	24.89	24.64	24.86
White Photos			
Pre-test	28.20	26.94	27.48
Post-test	28.96	28.19	26.89

School E

	Grade IX N-37	Grade X N-45	Grade XI N-28
Black Photos			
Pre-test	44.61	46.14	44.98
Post-test	44.61	44.16	44.34
White Photos			
Pre-test	47.75	48.21	48.78
Post-test	48.67	49.98	47.57

Results of Pre-test Differences for Black and White Photographs:

In order to insure that experimental and control groups did not differ from one another initially in terms of pre-test scores, which might then result in spurious results because of a regression to the mean or ceiling effect phenomenon, an analysis of all pre-test scores for black and white photographs for Schools A-B, C, D, and E are contained in Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13 respectively.

Table 10 reveals that School A did differ significantly from School B (its control) in terms of pre-test scores on black photographs ($F = 7.62$, significant at the .01 level). An inspection of means in Table 5 reveal that School B was significantly lower in pre-test scores, or more positive in their ratings of black photos. Since no differences were found between experimentals and controls in terms of the difference scores for black photographs, this finding does not affect the results discussed thus far. One could, however, interpret the tendency for experimentals to drop in post-test scores, while controls tended to rise as a regression toward the mean. This F ratio in Table 1 of 2.86 was not statistically significant.

Another pre-test difference, this time on white photographs, also appeared with respect to grade level in Schools A-B ($F = 3.85$, significant at the .05 level). Again, Table 5 indicates that this was due to a tendency among all students to become more negative in their evaluation of white photographs as grade level increased. However, this does not affect the differences already discussed in terms of experimentals and controls by grade level, since there were no differences in pre-test scores between Schools A and B <u>at each grade level</u>. Thus, the pre-test scores of experimentals and controls for each grade were similar (as evidenced by the A x C F ratio in Table 10 of .71) on white photographs.

No differences for School C were found in terms of pre-test scores as evidenced by Table 11. However, Table 12 shows that at the Grade VI level in School D, there were grade level differences between experimentals and controls in pre-test scores for white photographs ($F = 5.79$, significant at the .05 level). This means that the film effect x grade level interaction previously seen in Table 3 must be interpreted with great caution, for although lower socio-economic experimental males did rise in post-test scores, while their controls dropped, they did begin at different levels with experimentals having lower pre-test scores than controls. One should note, however, that although higher socio-economic male controls started out at an equally high level, they went up in post-test score, which does suggest that "regression toward the mean" is not sufficient explanation to account for differences previously discussed. In addition, lower socio-economic female controls, in spite of high pre-test scores, also continued to increase in post-testing. It is, however, impossible to gauge the exact effect of the different pre-test level in terms of the effect on post-test scores.

No other pre-test differences were found at either School D or School E, although at the latter, a film x socio-economic level interaction of 2.93 does appear, which, however, fails to reach the level required for statistical significance (3.89 for .05 level). An examination of means in Table 8 does reveal that there were initial differences between lower socio-economic experimentals and controls. However, since the F ratio obtained for the differences scores was at the .01 level, and since the increase in post-testing was far beyond what one would anticipate finding in a regression toward the mean, it is not felt that this initial difference could account for the previously presented results.

Table 10

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at Schools A (Experimental Group) and B (Control Group)

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	207.24	7.62**	9.37	.53
B - Sex	1	7.01	.26	17.67	1.00
C - Grade	3	15.05	.55	67.71	3.85*
D - Socio-economic	1	18.02	.66	.42	.02
A X B	1	1.33	.05	4.05	.22
A X C	3	3.47	.13	12.48	.71
A X D	1	20.38	.75	10.72	.61
B X C	3	35.38	1.30	11.52	.65
B X D	1	4.74	.17	22.54	1.45
C X D	3	20.83	.76	17.94	1.02
A X B X C	3	34.29	1.26	3.65	.20
A X B X D	1	32.28	1.87	7.24	.41
A X C X D	3	34.25	1.26	38.41	2.18
B X C X D	3	1.71	.06	1.36	.08
A X B X C X D	3	5.53	.20	.86	.05
S	291	27.20		17.61	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 11

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School C

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Soutce	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film	1	2.48	.10	.03	.00
B - Sex	1	44.58	1.95	.40	.03
C - Grade	2	4.43	.19	23.35	1.72
D - Socio-economic	1	2.28	.10	29.82	2.20
A X B	1	4.80	.21	1.73	.12
A X C	2	6.07	.26	11.92	.88
A X D	1	19.98	.87	4.09	.30
B X C	2	14.44	.63	14.70	1.08
B X D	1	30.74	1.35	1.75	.12
C X D	2	19.75	.86	1.00	.07
A X B X C	2	31.57	1.38	1.06	.08
A X B X D	1	17.65	.77	23.08	1.71
A X C X D	2	10.21	.45	20.77	1.54
B X C X D	2	39.88	1.75	21.59	1.59
A X B X C X D	2	54.87	2.40	16.53	1.22
S	168	22.82		13.52	

Table 12

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photographs at School D for Grades VI and VIII

		Black Photographs		White Photographs	
Grade VI	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	10.43	.39	3.24	.21
B - Sex	1	2.57	.09	9.88	.65
C - Grade (Does not apply)					
D - Socio-economic	1	.19	.00	1.68	.11
A X B	1	70.23	.26	87.58	5.79*
A X D	1	.75	.03	8.89	.58
B X D	1	13.68	.52	2.95	.19
A X B X D	1	5.16	.19	1.92	.13
S	62	26.40		15.12	
Grade VIII					
A- Film Effect	1	.49	.00	56.05	1.56
B - Sex	1	25.97	.37	25.63	.71
C (Does not apply)					
D - Soci-economic	1	161.42	2.29	.33	.00
A X B	1	47.85	.68	117.67	3.28
A X D	1	77.00	1.09	37.11	1.03
B X D	1	4.28	.06	10.18	.28
A X B X D	1	22.26	.31	112.70	3.14
S	62	70.31		35.87	

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 13

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Black and White Photogr

School E

		Black Photographs		White Phot
Source	df	MS	FFratios	MS
A - Film Effect	1	46.28	1.34	12.24
B - Sex (Does not apply)				
C - Grade	2	20.72	.60	16.01
D - Socio-economic	1	4.43	.12	22.28
A X C	2	7.93	.23	26.84
A X D	1	10.77	.31	46.50
C X D	2	4.04	.12	4.43
A X C X D	2	10.97	.32	11.84
S	98	34.43		15.88

Results for Social Survey Questions:

The results of the Social Survey Questions on white superiority and foreigner items for Grade VIII at School D, and for all grades at School E, are shown in Tables 14 and 15. None of the differences found at School D for W items reached the level necessary for statistical significance. However, at School E (Table 15), a number of differences appeared. Experimentals became significantly different from controls on W items following the film experience ($F = 6.46$, significant at the .01 level). An examination of the means in Table 17 reveal that experimentals became more critical of white superiority items following the films, while the controls appeared to drift in the opposite direction. There was also a significant film x grade x occupational level interaction ($F = 4.30$, significant at the .05 level). The means in Table 18 reveal that there was a tendency for lower occupational experimentals, at the Grade IX level, to change in a positive direction when compared to their controls following the films, but all the cell frequencies are so small that this result must be regarded with caution.

An F ratio of 7.91 (significant at the .01 level) when socio-economic level was considered at School E was also the result of changes among lower socio-economic males in that all of the students at this level tended to become more negative about their race over time (or more in agreement with white superiority attitudes) when compared with their higher socio-economic peers. As mentioned, however, exposure to the films seemed to impede this development among low occupation students.

In spite of the fact that no significant differences were found at School D for W items, the means for various subgroups are presented in Table 16. These do reveal that lower socio-economic males resembled those at School E in that experimentals tended to become more positive, while controls became more negative about their race following the film period. This was not true for females. However, these N's are too small to reach any comfortable conclusions. Also noted at School D was an F ratio of 5.48 (significant at the .05 level) when sex differences for foreigner items were analyzed. Table 16 reveals that females appear to become more negative toward foreigners over time than do males. This did not seem to be influenced by the experimental conditions, however.

Table 14

Analysis of Variance of White Superiority and Foreigner Items from the Social Survey Questions for Grade VIII Students at School D

		White Superiority		Foreigner Items	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	1.36	.02	31.39	.91
B - Sex	1	6.65	.13	188.41	5.48*
C - Grade (Does not apply)					
D - Occup. Level	1	14.12	.27	72.37	2.10
A X B	1	145.19	2.82	12.45	.36
A X D	1	.40	.00	6.48	.19
B X D	1	1.81.	.03	122.15	3.55
A X B X D	1	47.72	.92	59.23	1.72
S	57	51.52		34.38	3.30

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 15

Analysis of Variance of White Superiority and Foreigner Items from the Social Survey Questions for Students at School E

		White Superiority		Foreigner Items	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	201.60	6.46**	15.59	.47
B - Sex (Does not apply)					
C - Grade	2	26.04	.83	45.91	1.39
D - Occup. Level	1	246.81	7.91**	28.28	.86
A X C	2	61.19	1.96	14.21	.43
A X D	1	100.38	3.21	10.64	.32
C X D	2	18.45	.59	70.63	2.14
A X C X D	2	268.40	4.30*	7.48	.22
S	93	31.18		32.98	

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

Table 16

Means for White Superiority and Foreigner Items for Experimental and Control Grade VIII Students by Sex and Socio-economic Levels at School D

	Experimentals				Controls			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
White Items	High N-11	Low N-5	High N-12	Low N-3	High N-12	Low N-7	High N-8	Low N-7
Pre-test	18.36	22.40	19.75	18.33	19.83	19.57	20.00	19.71
Post-test	17.54	19.20	21.42	20.67	20.91	21.71	20.75	17.00
Foreigner Items								
Pre-test	22.45	22.00	23.33	19.00	20.83	27.71	22.25	16.29
Post-test	21.36	18.79	21.83	25.67	20.83	28.43	24.12	20.71

Table 17

Means for White Superiority and Foreigner Items for Experimentals and Controls by Socio-economic Level at School E

	Experimentals		Controls	
White Items	High N-34	Low N-17	High N-32	Low N-22
Pre-test	18.49	18.42	18.78	16.78
Post-test	16.76	17.95	17.97	21.71
Foreigner Items				
Pre-test	21.45	24.97	24.13	24.05
Post-test	20.61	24.59	23.44	25.28

Table 18

Means for White Superiority Items for Experimentals and Controls with Grade and Socio-economic Level at School E

Experimentals

	Grade IX		Grade X		Grade XI	
	High N-13	Low N-7	High N-16	Low N-5	High N-5	Low N-5
Pre-test	18.38	21.86	17.50	17.00	19.60	16.40
Post-test	17.61	18.86	15.06	17.60	17.60	17.40

Controls

	Grade IX		Grade X		Grade XI	
	High N-8	Low N-5	High N-9	Low N-14	High N-15	Low N-3
Pre-test	19.00	15.20	20.00	18.14	17.33	17.00
Post-test	17.50	26.00	19.55	18.14	16.86	21.00

Results for Wished For and Predicted Goals:

Previous research with this instrument (Teahan and Hug, 1969) had shown that experimentals tended to decrease in "Wished For" goals and increase in "Predicted" goals following the film experience. Controls, on the other hand, tended to drift in the opposite direction over time. However, no such trends were noted in the present data and hence a comparison of the difference between difference scores for "Wished For" versus "Predicted" goals is not shown in the analyses. Instead, each is considered separately.

The results of the "Wished For" and "Predicted" goals are contained in Tables 19, 20, 21, and 22 for Schools A-B, C, D, and E respectively. It should be noted that since this instrument was used for both elementary and high school students alike, School D could be analyzed as an entity rather than having to separate Grade VI from Grade VIII, while discarding Grade VII as was done with the photographs. The results are difficult to interpret, however, since there appears to be consistency in only two of the tables, i.e., between results at Schools A-B and C. Table 19 reveals three significant interactions in terms of "Wished For" goals at Schools A-B. A film x grade x occupational level ($F=3.91$, significant at the .05 level); a sex x grade x occupational level ($F=4.46$, significant at the .01 level) were all found. This seemed due essentially to lower socio-economic males making higher occupational "wishes" as grade increased (see Table 23). There was a trend for this to be more pronounced among experimentals, while their controls tended to decrease. However, these latter results must be viewed with great skepticism and caution, since cell frequencies drop too low to be considered adequate, particularly at higher grade levels among experimentals and at all grade levels among controls when sexes are separated. In addition, the analysis of variance program used tended to give "mean scores" in order to balance for unequal frequencies and, therefore, all of these higher order interactions with low frequencies must be approached with considerable caution.

School C (Table 20) showed a similar film x sex x grade x occupation interaction as was found in Schools A-B with an F ratio of 3.95, significant at the .05 level. However, there do not appear to be any readily identifiable trends in the means (Table 24) to account for this, and the same criticism of this result can be made as reported earlier concerning Schools A-B, namely, that cell frequencies are too small to trust this difference. As with Schools A-B, no differences were noted in terms of "Predicted" goals.

The results at School D shown in Table 21 reveal little or no similarity to Schools A-B or C and the only significant differences found here were in terms of "Predicted" goals. Significant F ratios of 4.70 and 4.00, both significant at the .05 levels, were found in terms of sex and socio-economic differences, with both males and lower socio-economic students tending to increase on post-testing regardless of whether they were experimentals or controls (see Table 25.) In addition, a significant film x sex x grade x socio-economic level interaction was found, but this time in terms of "Predicted," rather than "Wished For" goals as was true of other schools. This seemed due, in part, to higher

socio-economic experimentals increasing in post-test scores as compared to their controls. Again, however, cell frequencies are so small that it is difficult to place much weight upon this result, especially when it differs from other schools and seems so internally inconsistent.

At School E (Table 22), no differences were found on either "Predicted" or "Wished For" goals and the only difference approaching significance was again a film x grade x socio-economic status interaction (sex does not apply at this school) and this F ratio of 2.68 is significant at about the .10 level. An examination of means seemed to indicate that the greatest changes in "Wished For" goals were between lower socio-economic experimentals and controls at the lowest grade level. This seems to bear no relationship to findings at other schools and again may be due to chance, especially since it failed to gain the level required for statistical significance.

Table 19

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions for Students at Schools A (Experimental) and B (Control)

S		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	28.71	.45	83.84	.76
B - Sex	1	9.36	.15	63.25	.58
C - Grade	3	122.08	1.92	149.05	1.36
D - Socio-economic	1	64.88	1.02	50.30	.46
A X B	1	88.91	1.40	16.45	.15
A X C	3	13.68	.22	24.61	.22
A X D	1	47.62	.75	189.48	1.73
B X C	3	22.68	.36	97.54	.89
B X D	1	2.88	.04	411.59	3.76
C X D	3	85.94	1.35	25.16	.23
A X B X C	3	80.93	1.27	30.76	.28
A X B X D	1	2.06	.03	5.46	.05
A X C X D	3	248.18	3.91**	85.29	.77
B X C X D	33	182.14	2.87*	71.92	.66
A X B X C X D	3	283.47	4.46**	91.30	.83
S	247	63.44		109.57	

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

Table 20

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions for Students at School C

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	11.23	.25	50.83	.60
B - Sex	1	32.54	.73	57.33	.67
C - Grade	2	14.16	.32	29.43	.34
D - Socio-economic	11	3.18	.07	265.72	3.11
A X B	1	3.97	.09	12.82	.15
A X C	2	66.66	1.50	75.26	.88
A X D	1	16.42	.37	61.32	.72
B X C	2	1.49	.03	7.11	.08
B X D	1	9.42	.21	25.38	.29
C X D	2	13.82	.31	117.60	1.37
A X B X C	2	47.02	1.06	45.25	.53
A X B X D	1	19.11	.43	.11	.00
A X C X D	2	51.03	1.14	125.43	1.47
B X C X D	2	12.93	.29	5.11	.06
A X B X C X D	2	176.11	3.95*	55.51	.65
S	158	44.54		85.26	

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 21

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions at School D

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	42.17	.80	71.82	.94
B - Sex	1	11.07	.21	359.42	4.70*
C - Grade	2	1.21	.02	168.20	2.20
D - Socio-economic	1	19.35	.37	306.43	4.00**
A X B	1	123.47	2.33	1.53	.02
A X C	2	146.83	2.77	70.24	.92
A X D	1	1.59	.03	85.93	1.12
B X C	2	35.49	.67	149.64	1.96
B X D	1	5.08	.09	18.50	.24
C X D	2	152.08	2.87	70.07	.92
A X B X C	2	73.55	1.39	118.05	1.54
A X B X D	1	118.45	2.23	152.71	1.99
A X C X D	2	36.65	.69	3.31	.04
B X C X D	2	70.94	1.34	67.94	.89
A X B X C X D	2	28.29	.53	336.45	4.40*
S	153	52.90		76.52	

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 22

Analysis of Variance of Goals and Predictions at School E

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratio
A - Film Effect	1	12.48	.26	112.37	.84
B - Sex (Does not apply)					
C - Grade	2	63.98	1.33	328.10	2.46
D - Socio-economic	1	49.51	1.03	3.32	.02
A X C	2	69.66	1.45	201.58	1.51
A X D	1	46.97	.98	390.52	2.93
C X D	2	21.12	.44	6.07	.04
A X C X D	2	128.85	2.68	79.67	.60
S	94	48.05		133.26	

Table 23

Means for High and Low Socio-economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on "Wished For" Goals at Schools A-B

Experimentals

	Grade V		Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Males	N-6	N-16	N-5	N-15	N-5	N-12	N-13	N-10
Pre-test	71.67	71.94	77.80	73.20	76.20	74.25	70.23	72.50
Post-test	72.16	74.06	74.60	72.07	73.80	71.58	75.69	71.70
Females	N-5	N-3	N-10	N-22	N-10	N-22	N-12	N-12
Pre-test	74.80	70.23	71.80	73.27	66.50	73.09	71.25	74.08
Post-test	78.20	75.69	68.60	71.04	68.80	74.50	71.25	73.25

Controls

Males	N-1	N-7	N-1	N-6	N-4	N-12	N-2	N-2
Pre-test	72.00	73.28	75.00	73.83	66.00	74.50	84.50	68.00
Post-test	90.00	68.14	74.40	72.17	71.25	74.50	76.00	78.50
Females	N-2	N-10	N-3	N-8	N-7	N-15	N-4	N-7
Pre-test	76.00	72.10	69.00	70.62	67.14	68.80	75.00	75.43
Post-test	77.50	70.10	72.00	68.12	64.71	72.33	78.25	72.00

Table 24

Means for High and Low Socio-economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on "Wished For" Goals at School C

Experimentals

	Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Males	N-7	N-5	N-6	N-8	N-6	N-11
Pre-test	74.86	75.60	79.83	75.12	69.50	72.54
Post-test	76.43	76.80	76.33	75.50	72.17	72.45
Females	N-8	N-8	N-8	N-8	N-10	N-11
Pre-test	70.75	70.75	73.00	70.00	74.10	72.91
Post-test	76.38	69.25	74.00	71.25	73.40	72.92

Controls

	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Males	N-8	N-5	N-7	N-4	N-11	N-5
Pre-test	75.88	80.80	76.57	81.50	77.36	68.00
Post-test	76.25	78.20	79.14	82.75	72.82	68.20
Females	N-8	N-7	N-8	N-4	N-12	N-7
Pre-test	71.37	72.71	71.12	76.50	74.67	71.43
Post-test	68.62	75.71	72.50	78.25	77.42	69.71

Table 25

Means for High and Low Socio-economic Male and Female Experimentals and Controls on Predicted Goals at School D

Experimentals

	Grade VI		Grade VII		Grade VIII	
Males	High N-8	Low N-5	High N-6	Low N-6	High N-11	Low N-8
Pre-test	67.00	65.20	71.00	77.67	75.73	73.38
Post-test	72.88	76.00	74.67	71.67	74.27	76.75
Females	N-11	N-6	N-3	N-4	N-12	N-3
Pre-test	66.18	64.50	74.33	64.50	70.33	72.00
Post-test	64.91	67.67	68.67	67.75	72.67	69.00

Controls

Males	High N-6	Low N-10	High N-9	Low N-3	High N-11	Low N-7
Pre-test	68.50	67.20	75.22	68.00	77.64	63.71
Post-test	68.33	73.70	73.44	76.33	73.45	64.14
Females	N-13	N-8	N-6	N-6	N-8	N-7
Pre-test	77.08	69.25	68.33	68.83	68.50	64.57
Post-test	72.00	70.62	65.67	63.00	68.37	66.14

Results for Pre-test Differences on "Wished For" and Predicted Goals:

Although there were no apparently consistent differences between experimentals and controls in terms of difference scores, an examination and analysis of pre-test scores did reveal some more pronounced trends running through all schools. Tables 26, 27, 28, and 29 show the analysis of variance for pre-test scores on Goals and Predictions for Schools A-B, C, D, and E respectively; and Table 30 contains the pre-test means for higher and lower socio-economic status males and females at these schools.

The first large and consistent difference which emerged at almost every school was a sex difference on pre-test scores for Predicted goals and an F ratio of 12.18, significant at beyond the .01 level, was found at Schools A-B (see Table 26). At School C, (Table 27), significant F ratios for sex were found for both "Wished For" (F=5.95, significant at the .05 level) and Predicted (F=7.33, significant at the .01 level) Goals. At School D, an F ratio of 6.06, significant at the .01 level, was found for sex on the "Wished For" goals measure, while at School E, which had only males, no such comparison was possible. An examination of the means in Table 30 reveal that the consistent reason for these sex differences is the result of lower "Wished For" and Predicted goals among females, especially on the latter measure.

Some fair degree of consistency occurred when socio-economic status was examined in terms of its influence on pre-test scores. At Schools A-B, an F ratio of 5.12, significant at the .05 level, was found for Predicted success, as well as a sex x occupational level interaction (F=7.28, significant at the .01 level). This latter difference was due to the particularly poor Predicted success of lower socio-economic males when compared to their high socio-economic peers (see Table 30).

At School C (Table 27), a triple interaction of experimental-control x sex x socio-economic (F=3.27, significant at the .05 level of confidence) seemed to indicate that lower socio-economic students in the control group had higher initial "Wished For" goals, but cell frequencies were too low here to give this result much credence. However, on Predicted goals, lower socio-economic students were again lowest in goal choices (F=1.62) as had been found in Schools A-B, although this result was not statistically significant. At School D (Table 28), the socio-economic variable on Predictions again produced a significant difference between the low and high occupation group (F=5.30, significant at the .05 level) with lows again making poorer predictions of future success than highs.

For some reason, at School D, experimental students also increased in both "Wished For" (F=4.38, significant at the .05 level) goals and Predictions (F=3.30, significant at the .05 level) as grade level increased. An opposite trend was true for the control group on these same measures. Since this result was not found at other schools, it is difficult to interpret it as reflecting any general characteristic. The same is true for a grade x occupational level interaction, also found at School D, in "Wished For" goals (F=3.87, significant at the .05 level) where lower socio-economic students, at Grade VII, appeared to be higher than the higher socio-economic students in "Wished For," while at the Grade VIII level, they were lower. Results of such low internal consistency, especially when they are not found at other schools, are equally suspect. The same is

true for the quadruple interaction of experimental-control x sex x grade x occupation at this same school, which also suffers from previous criticisms regarding low cell frequencies.

Finally, a socio-economic difference also appeared at School E (Table 29) on Predictions ($F=7.61$, significant at the .01 level). This is, of course, consistent with the results found at Schools A-B and D, since lower socio-economic students were again found to have significantly lower pre-test scores on Predictions.

An examination of all the means in Table 30, therefore, confirms that consistent trends, most of them statistically significant, are present in the schools. The pattern that emerges is that females are lower than males on both measures, but especially in terms of predicted success. Lower socio-economic males, however, are almost as low as lower socio-economic women in terms of predicted success, while there is little difference between high and low males in terms of "Wished For" goals.

Table 26

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at Schools A & B

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	.36	.00	54.37	.06
B - Sex	1	95.02	1.14	1163.55	12.18**
C - Grade	3	61.78	.74	43.24	.45
D - Socio-economic	1	4.73	.05	488.72	5.12*
A X B	1	.01	.00	241.91	2.53
A X C	3	92.60	1.11	86.03	.90
A X D	1	15.43	.18	.05	.00
B X C	3	60.78	.73	9.08	.09
B X D	1	46.47	.55	695.60	7.28**
C X D	3	73.57	.88	34.78	.36
A X B X C	3	14.15	.17	24.11	.25
A X B X D	1	1.00	.01	195.22	2.04
A X C X D	3	89.11	1.07	146.03	1.53
B X C X D	3	77.53	.93	65.65	.68
A X B X C X D	3	97.91	1.18	88.74	.93
S	247	83.06		95.50	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 27

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School C

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	103.76	1.46	3.42	.03
B - Sex	1	422.80	5.95*	700.62	7.33**
C - Grade	2	116.17	1.64	68.39	.72
D - Socio-economic	1	.38	.00	155.16	1.62
A X B	1	11.65	.16	60.04	.63
A X C	2	10.20	.14	117.58	1.23
A X D	1	23.81	.33	150.42	1.57
B X C	2	442.75	3.11*	162.13	1.70
B X D	1	.02	.00	2.32	.02
C X D	2	74.07	1.04	86.15	.90
A X B X C	2	8.64	.12	252.39	2.64
A X B X D	1	11.31	.16	123.71	1.30
A X C X D	2	232.50	3.27*	239.89	2.51
B X C X D	2	11.67	.16	99.67	1.04
A X B X C X D	2	45.07	.63	55.03	.58
S	158	71.04		95.53	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 28

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School D

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	53.76	.94	6.39	.07
B - Sex	1	345.33	6.06**	122.81	1.50
C - Grade	2	14.26	.25	125.14	1.53
D - Socio-economic	1	1.61	.03	433.98	5.30*
A X B	1	.00	.00	53.54	.65
A X C	2	249.58	4.38*	269.97	3.30*
A X D	1	.76	.01	179.17	2.19
B X C	2	137.50	2.41	155.82	1.90
B X D	1	65.91	1.16	.36	.00
C X D	2	220.53	3.87*	15.12	.18
A X B X C	2	75.61	1.33	36.66	.45
A X B X D	1	130.77	2.30	142.96	1.75
A X C X D	2	18.18	.32	41.54	.51
B X C X D	2	56.53	.99	121.40	1.48
A X B X C X D	2	217.95	3.83*	186.22	2.28
S	153	56.95		81.80	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 29

Analysis of Variance of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions at School E

		Like to Become		End Up As	
Source	df	MS	F ratios	MS	F ratios
A - Film Effect	1	2.44	.05	5.70	.06
B - Sex (Does not apply)					
C - Grade	2	63.69	1.30	127.12	1.45
D - Socio-economic	1	89.89	1.84	193.33	2.21
A X C	2	84.18	1.72	183.43	2.09
A X D	1	76.29	1.56	665.38	7.61**
C X D	2	167.58	3.43	31.79	.36
A X C X D	2	28.37	.58	6.53	.07
S	94	48.82		87.45	

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Table 30

Means of Pre-test Scores for Goals and Predictions of High and Low Socio-economic Males and Females at All Schools

	Goals				Predictions	
School A and B	Males	(N)	Females	(N)	Males	Females
High Socio-economis	74.17	(37)	71.44	(53)	75.64	67.63
Low Socio-economic	72.69	(80)	72.20	(99)	65.65	66.35
School C						
High Socio-economic	75.67	(45)	72.50	(54)	73.17	68.84
Low Socio-economic	75.59	(37)	72.38	(45)	71.01	67.14
School D						
High Socio-economic	74.64	(51)	72.92	(53)	72.51	70.79
Low Socio-economic	75.76	(39)	71.38	(34)	69.19	67.28
School E						
Higher Socio-economic	76.25	(67)	--		71.71	--
Lower Socio-economic	74.06	(39)	--		68.50	--

Discussion of Results

In the present findings, lower socio-economic males at two schools became significantly more negative toward white photos following the films. In one other school, where students also saw both black and white films, which was the experimental condition used in a previous study of this nature, the experimental males became more negative toward white photos at only the Grade VI level, while at Grade VIII, experimentals (again, primarily male lower socio-economic) became more positive toward black photos, but did not change toward white photos. However, one of the problems encountered in evaluating the results of this school was the fact that cell frequencies became very small when a breakdown was made in terms of sex, socio-economic status and experimental condition. This was because grade levels had to be analyzed separately. Thus, while cell frequencies ranged from 15 to 28 at School C and from 18 to 36 at School E, they dropped to a range of 3 to 13 at School D with most cells being lower than 10. Thus, it is very difficult to make any decision about the findings at School D when one has separated experimental condition into levels of sex and socio-economic status.

At School A, the only significant change noted was also in terms of white photos with experimentals again becoming more negative as grade level or the age of students increased. Since this school is predominantly lower class, as opposed to the other schools which were primarily middle class, this may account in part for the fact that there was no interaction with socio-economic status. It may well be that being middle class, in a mostly lower class setting, especially when this probably means that one lives in a lower class environment since these were neighborhood schools, may mean that one is equally impressed by successful blacks (who seem quite prosperous in the film) regardless of whether one's father has a skilled or non-skilled job. The older one is, the more one may react to a pride-producing stimulus (older to a point, of course). In addition, the fact that only black films were shown to these students may have also cut down on the "black back-lash" effect of becoming more negative toward whites as racial pride increased, since the inclusion of "white success stories" may in itself engender negative feelings.

It is difficult to explain all of the findings which emerged in all schools, particularly those which were internally inconsistent, i.e., which appeared at only one grade level, or seemed to represent no particular trend in any direction. Some of the differences which were not connected to the film experience may also represent accidental artifacts (for example, the fact that females at Grade 8 in School D were more negative toward foreigners). Since there was no opportunity to look for this at any other school, and the finding is both unexpected and not consistent with the data for females on other instruments, it may well be that this result was simply due to chance, especially when the subject number was low. For this reason, one looks for the consistent trends which seem to run through all schools and which logically seem to follow from some premises.

In this respect, there was some rather consistent evidence tha it was among lower socio-economic students, especially males, where these films had the greatest impact. This is not so surprising in view of the fact that the whole film experience was geared to the hypothesis that the lower socio-economic male suffers from a lack o successful models in his immediate environment with whom to identif and gain a sense of value and worth. As Ginsberg et. al. (1962) states, "persons of exceptional accomplishments may not be as helpf a guide to the Negro youngster as the knowledge that individuals no too different from himself have risen one or two rungs on the ladde (P. 107). Since the films used attempted to emphasize that a lower socio-economic beginning may still lead to success, they were essen tially geared to appeal to the low status child. Related to this i Trueblood's (1960) observation that most Negro youth (and by this h means poor inner-city youth) seemed to be totally ignorant about th community in which they lived and the vocational opportunities actu available to them. Thus, since the films themselves concerned succ ful black males, it is not unusual that the group most influenced w be lower socio-economic males.

The results of the Social Survey Questions also lend support t the findings of the photograph technique. Experimentals were found to become significantly more critical than controls of white superi ity items. Although this was true for all experimentals, whether t were of low or high socio-economic status, an examination of the me reveals that the greatest contribution came from the lower socio-economic status males (although the F ratio for film x occupation c 3.21 just failed to meet the level required for statistical signif Lower socio-economic controls who did not see the films became more negative about their race, over time, as evidenced by even greater support for white superiority items. Although the numbers were too small to deal with at School D when sex and socio-economic status w both considered, the lower socio-economic males again seemed to sho the greatest change with experimentals becoming more positive about their race, while controls moved in the opposite direction.

The results obtained from the W Items also lends support to th hypothesis that the more negative shift in the evaluations of white photographs, following films, may represent a sort of exploding of the white superiority myth among blacks as they gain in self-esteem Thus, it is not simply a matter of saying to himself, "I am better than I thought," but he also adds with even greater vehemence, "and you (whites) are much worse." This phenomenon may mean, therefore that the first step in a more positive self-concept, among blacks, may involve an externalization of previously internalized hostilit

These results are very similar to those found in a previous s by the investigator (Teahan and Hug, 1969) whose sample at that ti was an entirely lower socio-economic group of students from a smal midwestern industrial city. At the time of that investigation, th was little of the recognition now being given to blacks in films, television programs, and by national magazines and newspapers. Th black people in movies or on television generally played the role "Negroes," rather than being people who were also, incidentally, b In addition, the "black power" movement was just underway and feel